

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

A. Tariff Provision Language Should Not Supersede Interconnection Agreement Language. 3

B. The Proposed Tariff Lacks Specificity Regarding The Rates And Charges To Be Applied And Improperly Omits A Number Of Offerings That Should Be Available To CLECs. 4

C. The Proposed Tariff Contains Inflated Charges and Unreasonable Terms and Conditions. 5

II. TARIFF PROVISIONS SHOULD NOT SUPERCEDE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT PROVISIONS IF THE GOALS OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 ARE TO BE ACHIEVED. 8

A. The Telecommunications Act Requires Interconnection To Be Provided Through Negotiated Agreements To The Extent Possible. 8

B. A General Department Rule That Tariff Provisions Supersede Provisions Contained In Interconnection Agreements Would Conflict With The Requirements Of The Telecommunications Act. 9

C. If Tariff Provisions Are To Supersede Interconnection Agreement Provisions, It Is Imperative That Fair Notice And Review Procedures Are Established When Tariff Language Is Proposed That Will Affect The Terms Of Interconnection Agreements. 11

III. THE PROPOSED TARIFF DOES NOT PERMIT CLECS TO DETERMINE WHAT RATES AND CHARGES WILL APPLY WHEN THEY ORDER UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS FROM BELL ATLANTIC. 14

A. The Tariff Should Include Tables That Permit CLECs To Understand What Charges It Must Pay Under Various Scenarios. 14

B. Bell Atlantic Has Omitted Critical Charges, Offerings And Conditions From The Tariff. 17

1. Bell Atlantic has failed to identify the applicable charges for a number of service offerings it proposes to price on an individual case basis. 17

2. Bell Atlantic has failed to include offerings that it is required to make. 19

3. Bell Atlantic refuses to make off-site adjacent collocation available despite compelling reasons to do so. 22

4. Bell Atlantic refuses to incorporate performance standards into the tariff. 23

IV. THE PROPOSED TARIFF CONTAINS NUMEROUS INAPPROPRIATE CHARGES AND REQUIREMENTS AND RELIES ON IMPROPER COST STUDIES. 24

A. The Department Should Reject Bell Atlantic's GRIP Proposal In Any Form 25

1. Bell Atlantic's GRIP Proposal Is A Moving Target. 25

2. Bell Atlantic's GRIP Proposal Violate FCC Requirements, Violate Department Requirements and Are Anti competitive. 28

a. The Original and Revised GRIP Proposals Violate FCC Requirements. 28

b. The Original and Revised GRIP Proposals Violate Department Requirements. 29

c. The Original and Revised GRIP Proposals Are Anti competitive. 30

(1) In The Absence Of The GRIP Proposal The Costs Associated With Implementing Local Exchange Competition Are Shared Among All Carriers; Bell Atlantic's GRIP Proposal

Would Shift All Of Them On To The CLECs. 30

(2) Because The Costs At Issue Arise From The Onset Of Competition, It Would Be Anticompetitive To Allocate All Of Them To The New Entrants. 31

3. Although Bell Atlantic's "Increased" Costs Arising From The Introduction of Competition Should Not Be Recoverable From Its Competitors, Bell Atlantic's Estimate Of These Costs Is Unstable, Overstated And Unreliable. 35

a. Bell Atlantic Failed To Prove Any Increased Costs. 35

b. Bell Atlantic Made Substantial Errors Which Resulted In Overstated Cost Estimates. 37

B. Bell Atlantic's Collocation Offerings Are Based On Fundamentally Flawed Cost Studies And Contain Inappropriate Requirements And Limitations. 38

1. Bell Atlantic's collocation charges have been shown to be inaccurate, unreliable and inflated. 38

2. Bell Atlantic is seeking to impose unreasonable terms and conditions on collocation. 43

C. The Department should not approve Bell Atlantic's proposed OSS charges, which were rejected in the Consolidated Arbitrations or its proposed non-recurring cost charges, which the Department has ordered not to be considered in this docket. 46

D. Bell Atlantic's Enhanced Extended Link Offering Imposes Inappropriate Conditions On CLECs And Includes Inappropriate Charges. 48

E. There Are A Number Of Additional Miscellaneous Problems With The Tariff Proposal. 51